DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 302 95 SP 010 374

AUTHOR Buffie, Edward G.
TITLE Study of the Employment Status of Block Program Graduates. Teacher Education Forum; Volume 4, Number 7.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 76
GRANT OEG-0-72-0492-725
NOTE 25p.; For related documents, see SP 010 368-388

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Graduates; Cooperative Teaching; Departmental Teaching Plans; *Elementary School Teachers; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Statistics; *Graduate Surveys; Questionnaires; Teacher Education; *Teacher Employment; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Block Program; Indiana University Bloomington

ABSTRACT

The Block Program is one of five major options at Indiana University, Bloomington, for students preparing to become elementary teachers. The project emphasizes team approach to instruction; flexibility of program; carefully articulated work with respect to preparation in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies; carefully articulated collegiate and field experiences in the schools; and student representation in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program. A questionnaire concerning employment status was administered to 1973, 1974, and 1975 graduates of the program. The results indicate that almost 85 percent of those seeking full-time teaching positions were successful. About 80 percent hold positions in public schools organized on a self-contained basis; 20 percent are in schools featuring team teaching or departmentalization. Personal initiative on the part of the candidate in finding a position was judged to be important but not as significant as had been rumored. Some areas of future study concerning the Block Program are discussed. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128302

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ool of Education Indiana University/Bloomington

OID 374

TEACHER EDUCATION FORUM

The *Forum Series* is basically a collection of papers dealing with all phases of teacher education including inservice training and graduate study. It is intended to be a catalyst for idea exchange and interaction among those interested in all areas of teacher education. The reading audience includes teachers, school administrators, governmental and community administrators of educational agencies, graduate students and professors. The *Forum Series* represents a wide variety of content: position papers, research or evaluation reports, compendia, state-of-the-art analyses, reactions/critiques of published materials, case studies, bibliographies, conference or convention presentations, guidelines, innovative course/program descriptions, and scenarios are welcome. Manuscripts usually average ten to thirty double-spaced typewritten pages; two copies are required. Bibliographical procedures may follow any accepted style; however, all footnotes should be prepared in a consistent fashion. Manuscripts should be submitted to Linda S. Gregory, editor. Editorial decisions are made as soon as possible; accepted papers usually appear in print within two to four months.

LINDA S. GREGORY, editor
Indiana University

RICHARD P. GOUSHA
dean-school of education

LEO C. FAY
director-dte

HAROLD HARTY
assoc. director
dissemination-dte

ROBERT J. SEIBEL
publications editor-dte

ADVISORY BOARD

ROGER EMIG
City of E. Chicago (Ind.)

GENE FARIS
Indiana University

DAVID GLIESSMAN
Indiana University

EDWARD JENKINSON
Indiana University

CARMEN PEREZ
Indiana University

ROBERT RICHEY
Indiana University

SIV THIAGARAJAN
Indiana University

RONALD WALTON
Bloomington (Ind.) Schools

Produced by the Division of Teacher Education, Indiana University-Bloomington, a component of the School of Education, supported in part by way of an Institutional Grant (OE-OEG: 0-72-0492:725) with funds from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Office of Education, under the provisions of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development as a project. The opinions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

Study of the Employment Status of Block Program Graduates

EDWARD G. BUFFIE

division of teacher education
323 education building
indiana university
bloomington, indiana 47401

April 1976

Volume 4 Number 7

The Block Program is one of five major options at Indiana University-Bloomington for students preparing to become elementary teachers. Three of these offerings are in fact complete professional programs; that is all professional components (courses, modules, experiences which together represent approximately 45 semester hours) are accounted for in the program itself. Presumably each component is well articulated and mutually reinforcing. The programs include the Early Childhood Program, the Encore Program, and the Multi-Cultural Program.

Block is not a program in the complete professional sense and should be more appropriately identified as a project since only 15 hours of professional preparation are included. Block is a professional semester for students in their second semester of the junior year or first semester of the senior year. The following characteristics are associated with this option: (1) team approach to instruction; (2) flexibility of program; (3) carefully articulated work with respect to preparation in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies; (4) carefully articulated collegiate and field experiences in the schools (optional but usually selected by 95 per cent of the participants); and (5) student representation in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program. As a rule students must sign up for all 15 hours which then ensures maximum flexibility in program planning. However, portions of the program may be waived as is true for those students who took math methods during the sophomore year (special project); on occasion students are permitted to participate in the program over two semesters or a summer and a semester because of unusual personal circumstances. As a rule about 85 to 90 per cent of the students will take the full compliment of hours in one semester.

Following the Block Semester students have several student teaching options. Such choices are generally not open to students in the ENCORE, Early Childhood, or Multi-Cultural programs. Students opting for campus-base take discrete courses in the manner students traditionally sign up for collegiate instruction. Faculty do not work together, and articulation between professional courses or between professional courses and field work does not occur as it does in the other four options. An overview of the options available to elementary majors is shown on the following page.

Rationale

When students have choices, they often raise questions about the various "programs." Answers to most of these have been readily available: Who teaches in the program? When and how are courses scheduled? How does one gain admission? What kinds of field experiences are provided? How will we be evaluated? What are the specific requirements? What are the unique characteristics of this program? However, we have not been able to answer the question: What happens to those who complete your program--Do they get jobs? One purpose of this study then was to find the answer to this question and, therefore, be responsive to our students.

EDWARD G. BUFFIE is *associate director,* Division of Teacher Education and *professor of education,* School of Education, Indiana University-Bloomington.

Options For Elementary Majors

Generalist Preparation

Campus-Based | **Block Program** | **Encore**

(Programs of Preparation for the generalist -- K-6 teachers/no particular reference to age, grade level, or background of students to be taught)

Choice of Student Teaching

- Non-Project
- Project
  - American Indian
  - Latino
  - Urban Semester
  - Bradford Woods
  - Rural Education

Specialized Preparation

Early Childhood Education

(Program of Preparation for Teachers of Young Children Ages 3-8)

Multi-Cultural Education

(Program of preparation for Teachers of Children with Multi-Cultural Backgrounds)*

Student Teaching Experience

All predetermined as a result of admission to program

*Backgrounds are also characterized by poverty.

The senior faculty of the Block Program have--in addition to the above concern--an interest in other questions:

1. What kind of teaching roles do our students assume? (Self-Contained/Departmentalization/Team Teaching/Differentiated Staffing)

2. At what level do students teach? (Primary, Intermediate, other)

3. How do students get jobs? (Placement Bureau/Help of Friends/Individual Initiation)

4. If students do not get teaching positions, what do they then do? Are they in related fields where their professional background has had a significant bearing upon obtaining jobs?

The data generated, particularly with respect to the first two questions, could contribute significantly to future programmatic decisions. For example, since the Block Program is one of three programs designed to prepare the generalist, would it be wise to vary what is already a successful program such that prospective teachers would be prepared for a new and different role? Rather than preparing teachers for the self-contained classroom--where one teaches everything with the possible exception of art, music, and/or physical education--should our focus change to something, for example, associated with team teaching? Considerable thought has been given to this alternative and plans already made in such anticipation. But should we move ahead? At the master's degree level, one option is provided essentially for those who teach (or wish to teach) in departmentalized situations. We've not had many takers--is there a market? We simply did not know prior to this study.

Procedures

A questionnaire was designed and then distributed to the Faculty/Student Committee of the Block Program. This group consists of senior faculty, associate instructors, graduate assistants, and undergraduate student representatives. They meet weekly or bi-weekly for purposes of planning, implementation, and evaluation. Their reactions provided the major input for questionnaire modification. This revised instrument was then forwarded to the Division Directors of Instruction and Curriculum and Teacher Education. Final modifications were made after we received their reactions and suggestions. See Appendix I for the questionnaire.

Questionnaires were sent out initially in November 1975. Permanent addresses had been obtained from the records of the Director of the Block Program. Enclosed with each questionnaire was a self-addressed, postage paid envelope. It was assumed at this time that our permanent address data were still accurate and that all students had gone on to complete graduation requirements according to the usual four-year calendar--that is, students in the Block Program in the fall of 1974 (first semester seniors) could be expected to graduate in May or August 1975.

Many questionnaires were returned, as one might anticipate. A check was then made with our records department, as well as other sources, to locate

more accurate address information. At this juncture we also discovered that some students had not completed their programs and degrees as assumed. On the basis of new information obtained, questionnaires were sent out to appropriate students once again.

On December 15, 1975, a follow-up questionnaire was sent to all non-respondents. A letter to parents requesting their assistance was also enclosed (See Appendix II). On January 15, 1976, we closed this phase of our search.

Assuming that the non-respondents fell into two groups--one, they didn't care to respond for some reason or other; or two, we were not able to locate them--we then turned our energies to other sources. A list of non-respondents was sent to the I.U. Bureau of Educational Placement. Students who get teaching positions are requested to return a white card to the Bureau. In addition, some school systems do notify our Placement Bureau when they hire our graduates. Some data were obtained from this source including present addresses and telephone numbers. We also checked with student records to see if any persons had applied for admission to graduate school. A few had.

The two major sources for gaining additional data related to faculty contact and the use of the telephone. Present as well as former faculty associated with the Block Program were able to provide considerable information. Since we have a specialized master's degree option for former participants in the undergraduate Block Program, many students were identified in this manner.

Telephone contact was made with non-respondents who had not been accounted for using any of the above procedures. Because of the cost factor, only Indiana students were contacted. In most instances, communication was with a parent rather than the student directly. This activity then represented our final attempt to identify the whereabouts of former students.

The Findings

This section has two major components. The first relates to data source. It is important to note that no student was accounted for in more than one category. Since we were checking several sources simultaneously, it is evident that some duplication would occur. When this happened, we simply used amount of information as a basis for classification. For example, a faculty member might report that Miss X has a job in Bloomington but the Placement Bureau provided the specific school, address, and telephone information as well. In such a case, the Placement Bureau would be identified as the source.

The other major portion of this section documents the actual results of this study.

Responses by Source

In studies of this type, the question of non-respondent bias is always raised. The most effective means of coping with such criticism is to maximize the percentage of return. For this reason a variety of sources was used to gather data. Using all these sources undoubtedly provides a much clearer view of the population being studied.

According to authorities in the field,[1] a 60 per cent return is good but not sufficient to eliminate completely the effects on non-respondent bias. To eliminate such a concern would require an 80 per cent response.

Considering the difficulty of tracking what is essentially a female population, the results of this effort have been exceptionally good. The mobility of young people whenever marriage takes place further complicated efforts to locate them. Locating one's graduates was a complex and at times, a frustrating experience but we were most fortunate. More than 90 per cent (actually 91.40%) have been accounted for in this study.

The Results

The results of this study are organized into three sections. In the first, our primary concern relates to those who were actually seeking teaching positions. Not all were ready to move into the market-place. Some simply did not graduate on the normal four-year student calendar assumed. And others, who did complete their degrees and thus qualify for a teaching certificate, did not choose to move directly into their chosen profession upon graduation. The second section deals with these students.

The last section provides data relative to role, grade level taught, change status and other matters.

Table III provides a limited overview regarding the first two concerns.

Those Seeking Teaching Positions

Tables IV through VIII describe what happened to the 203 students who were seeking full-time teaching positions. Of this number, 83.25 per cent were successful; however, not all students accepted positions after they found them. Hence, 78.82 per cent actually were teaching following their graduation from the University*. A word with respect to interpretation. Students who found jobs prior to Christmas (following May or August graduation) are included in the Found Teaching category in the figures noted below. Not many are involved but some did start out doing other things when school got underway in the fall. In a few weeks they were fortunate to find teaching jobs. There were also students who located positions in January or later (following graduation in May or August). They, however, are classified in other categories. Many students were able to find Related Positions--these are positions which require a degree, one where preparation as an elementary major was critical to employment. In most instances, these persons were serving as substitute teachers. If they were "subbing" more than three days a week (many were full-time), we placed them in this category. Other Related Positions included those associated with social work or teaching for the Peace Corps. Eighty-eight per cent held teaching or related positions.

The Other Job category includes all employment whereby one's major was not significant in obtaining a job, although the degree might have been. In all, 97.52 per cent of our students were employed.

[1] Wentling and Lawson, Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Programs (p. 154).

*Notice our concern here for what happened to students following graduation. We were not concerned with their present activities per se.

TABLE I

Responses by Source/Year of Graduation

	1973	1974	1975	Total
Questionnaire	34	82	76	192
Faculty	11	7	5	23
Telephone	1	7	10	18
Placement Bureau	1	3	0	4
Student Records	3	2	13	18
Subtotal	50	101	104	255
Unable To Locate	5	7	12	24
Total	55	108	116	279

TABLE II

Per Cent of Response by Combined Sources

	N	Total Population of N	% Responding
Not Able To Locate	24*	279	8.60
All Five Sources	285	279	91.40
Questionnaire	192	255	75.29
Faculty	23	255	9.02
Telephone	18	255	7.06
Placement Bureau	4	255	1.57
Student Records	18	255	7.06
Questionnaire/Faculty	215	255	84.31
Questionnaire/Faculty/ Telephone	233	255	91.37
Questionnaire/Faculty/ Telephone/Placement Bureau	237	255	92.94
Questionnaire/Faculty/ Telephone/Placement Bureau/Student Records	255	255	100.00

*February 6, 1976--Two of these persons have teaching positions. Number accounted for in study = 257 (92.11%). Percentage holding full-time teaching positions = 79.20%. Percentage holding teaching or related positions = 88.29%.

TABLE III

Participants in the Block Program*

	Number	Percentage
In The Block Program**	279	100.00
Did Not Graduate (As of December 1, 1975)	24	8.60
Completed All Requirements	255	91.40
Graduated/Qualified for Teaching Certificate	255	100.00
Available for Placement	203	79.61
Not Available for Placement	52	20.39
Available for Placement	203	100.00
Found Teaching Positions	160	78.82
Found Related Positions	19	9.36
Employed in Non-Related Positions	19	9.36
Unemployed and/or Graduate School	5	2.46
Not Available For Placement	52	100.00
Did Not Locate	24	46.15
Other Reasons	28	53.85

*This model for reporting manpower data is the same one used by the Federal Government. See Summary Date: Vocational Education. Fiscal Year 1974 published by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office of Education/Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education/ Office of Adult, Vocational, Technical, and Manpower Education/Division of Vocational and Technical Education.

**The Block Program is a professional semester which precedes student teaching. Completion of this semester does not necessarily mean that one will complete all other requirements and actually graduate.

TABLE IV

Students Looking For Positions Following Graduation

	Number	Percentage
Total Number Looking For Positions	203	100.00
Found Teaching Positions/Accepted	160	78.82
Found Teaching Positions/Turned Them Down	9	4.43
Total Who Were Successful	169	83.25
Other Employment	38	18.72
Found Related Positions	19	9.36
Found Unrelated Jobs	19	9.36
Actually in Teaching or Related Positions	179	88.18
Found Jobs	198	97.54
Not Employed	5	2.46

TABLE V

Data Source: Students Looking For Positions

	Questionnaire	Faculty	Telephone	Records	Placement Bureau	Total
Looking for Teaching Positions	164	19	16		4	203
Found Positions	128	19	9		4	160
Offered But Turned Down	(9)					(9)
Found Related Positions	15		4			19
Found Unrelated Jobs	16		3			19
Unsuccessful	5					5

TABLE VI

Related Positions

	1973	1974	1975	Total
Substitute Teaching		7	9	16
Peace Corps/Action		1		1
Social Work	1	1		2
				19

TABLE VII

Unrelated Employment

	1973	1974	1975	Total
Education				
Teacher Aid	1	2	2	5
Non-Education				
Managerial/Supervisory	1	1		2
Clerical	1	2	2	5
Business	1		1	2
Industry (Factory)	1			1
Legal (Law Office)			1	1
Library		3		3
				19

TABLE VIII

Offered Positions/Turned Down
(By Year/Reason)

	1973	1974	1975	Total
Low Salary		1		1
Bad Location (Too far to Travel)	1	1	1	3
Poor Conditions (Community/School/Class)		4		4
Prior Decision To Do Something Else	1			1
				9

Persons rejecting positions did so for a variety of reasons. More specifically, one decided to go into nursing education. Of the four categorized under Poor Conditions, one didn't like the community (700 persons just too small and isolated). Two felt the classes were too large (40+ pupils) and undisciplined--jobs became available in early September. The last indicated that there was a serious problem with respect to philosophy. None of these persons got full-time teaching positions and are reflected in other categories such as Related, Unrelated, or Unsuccessful.

Of those looking but not able to find full-time teaching positions initially (1973 and 1974 graduates), five now have teaching positions; three have since become substitutes; one has since become a teacher's aid; and one has set up a part-time tutorial business (in addition to doing substitute work).

Of 1975 graduates looking but not able to find full-time teaching positions, one has just been employed and three more report they are likely to move into such positions shortly. These last three persons are presently serving as Teacher's Aids (2) or substituting (1).

Those Not Seeking Teaching Positions

As already noted, 52 of the 255 students included in the study were not seeking teaching positions at the time of the study. Twenty-four of these are easily accounted for since they had not yet graduated from the University. But what about the other 28, why weren't they in the job market? Table IX provides these data.

TABLE IX

Did Not Choose To Seek Positions: The Reasons

	1973	1974	1975	Total
Went to Graduate School	1	2	2	5
Married/Raising Family	2	1	1	4
Wanted Some Time Off			2	2
Relocation Uncertain		3	5	8
Teaching Not For Me (Interested Other Jobs)	2	3	1	6
Jobs Scarce/Decided Not To Look	2	1		3
Did Not Graduate	3	2	19	24
				52

TABLE X

Data Source: Students Not Looking For Positions

	Questionnaire	Faculty	Telephone	Records	Placement Bureau	Total
Not Looking For Teaching Positions	28	4	2	18		52
Didn't Graduate	8			16		24
Other Reasons						
Went To Graduate School	2	1		2		5
Married/Raising Family	2	2				4
Location Uncertain	7	3				10
Jobs Scarce	3					3
Interests/Other Jobs	6					6

Following graduation, nine persons were not employed because of family responsibilities or they were in graduate school (Education). Three others just took an extended travel trip after finishing their schooling. Relocation problems in every instance were related to a husband's situation--he was just finishing his own schooling or had not yet found a job (still looking). While not seeking teaching positions 16 other persons were seeking some sort of employment. They ended up in a wide variety of jobs. Some became secretaries, one became an auditor, another went in the wholesale jewelery business. Other students clerked or cashiered in stores. Vista Volunteers claimed another (could be classified as Related Position). And, finally, one student is now with Senator Birch Bayh (legislation researcher).

Of those not looking for teaching positions initially (graduates of 1973 and 1974), three now have full-time teaching positions; one is now a full-time substitute; and one is now a teacher's aid.

Teaching Role, Level of Assignment, and Change Status

The data gathered here are not very complete. In many instances, this section of the questionnaire was simply not filled out. This usually occurred when parents filled out the forms but sometimes with students as well.* Information gleaned from other sources simply was not available, as happened in interviews with faculty and parents (telephone).

*Few questionnaires were filled out by parents--six at the most. Parents usually forwarded the questionnaire to their children.

TABLE XI

Teaching Role, Level, Change of Positions
(Those Holding Full-Time Positions)

	1973	1974	1975	Total
Level				
Nursery				
Primary (K-3)	15	27	24	66
Intermediate (4-6)	4	22	16	42
Junior High School/Middle School			1	1
Special Education (Nongraded)	2	6	3	11
Specialist--Reading Teacher		1	1	2
				122
Teaching Role				
Self-Contained	11	50	34	95
Departmentalized	2	5	5	12
Team (or Cooperative) Teaching	1	5	5	11
Differentiated Staffing				
				118
Teaching Location (Change since initial position)				
Same School (No Change)	17	50		67
Now Teaching Different School System	3	8		11
No Longer Teaching	1	3		4
				82

Those who found teaching positions this year (1975-76) are all in the same location. They did not respond to this portion of the survey.

Results: How Positions Were Attained, Locations, And Other Observations

Considering that the students included in this survey graduated within the last 30 months, their geographical distribution is amazing. They are presently located in 22 states including Alaska and Hawaii, and Nicaragua (See Appendix III).

Tables XII and XIII describe the efforts of students in finding jobs. Emphasis upon individual initiative is clearly highlighted in these data. Friends are also mentioned frequently as a major help in finding positions. The number of applications varied considerably, some students finding positions on the first try while others (8) made more than 40 applications for jobs. One student reported 200 contacts and two others said they made 75 to 100 applications. "Approximately ten" was the most common response. The data gathered here suffered a little from the same types of problems discerned previously--information not always noted.

TABLE XII

Getting A Position: Key Source

Indiana University Placement Office		Friend		Professional Association		Personal Application		Others*		Total Responses	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
13	8.13	31	19.38	7	4.38	100	62.50	9	5.63	160	100

*Help of Principal (from student teaching experience) or as a result of substitution work.

TABLE XIII

Number of Applications

1-10		11-20		21-30		31-40		41+		Total Responses	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
109	68.99	21	13.29	13	8.23	7	4.43	8	5.06	158	100

In describing their school situations, two students indicated they were teaching in "open schools" and one was with an alternative school. Three others noted that they were teaching in private schools.

Conclusions

With respect to the five questions investigated, it would seem reasonable to conclude the following.

Participants in the Block Program who move on to complete their degree requirements and then move actively into the job market seeking full-time positions are successful in achieving their objectives. Of those seeking full-time teaching positions, almost 85 per cent of our students find them. Not that they always accept teaching offers, they don't. Nevertheless, about 80 per cent were engaged in full-time teaching within six months of graduation. When considering teaching and other related positions, the figure rises to 88 per cent. Impressive figures, to say the least.

Most Block students are assuming positions in public schools which are organized on a Self-Contained basis (about 80 per cent). The remainder, about equally divided, go into schools featuring Team Teaching or Departmentalization. If the data were more complete, we would probably find these figures (about 10 per cent each) somewhat inflated. Most students wrote back personal notes describing their situations, especially if they were somewhat unique.

Based upon these data and the assumption that those who did not comment were probably in more traditional settings (Self-Contained), it would seem safe to conclude that there is no great necessity to change the thrust of the Block Program at this time to something associated with either Team Teaching or Departmentalized roles. This would also help to explain why so few persons are interested in Option III of the master's degree program, that which has been designed for teachers who would have specialized subject matter interests. We could easily drop this option with little noticeable effect upon enrollment.

The data provided with respect to level of teaching assignment, again somewhat incomplete, did not indicate anything of real significance. About one-half of the students teach in the primary grades and a little more than one-third in intermediate.

To find teaching positions will require considerable personal initiative on the part of each candidate, although it is not nearly as great an effort as has been rumored. About 70 per cent of our graduates filled out 1 to 10 application forms, not really too bad considering the current supply and demand situation. In about 20 per cent of the cases reported, having a friend really helped in obtaining a job.

With respect to the last question, we were not able to generate much new information relative to "related positions." We had hoped to get data about other types of employment--more specifically, jobs where one's elementary education background would be a real plus in gaining employment. Little was turned up at this time. Given the unusually high degree of success in finding teaching positions, the data here were very limited.

Next Steps

The information obtained in this study has been most interesting and will undoubtedly affect the behavior of both students and faculty in many ways. One can predict with some degree of confidence that students at lower levels will very much want to get into the Block Program once the results of this study are publicized. Students presently in the program are certainly encouraged about employment possibilities--they probably will put forth greater effort into professional studies now, both this semester and during student teaching. Last fall's group (Semester I 1975-76) already reflects such attitudes and behavior. Our post-graduates certainly ought to be please, and hopefully they will cooperate in some of the ways noted below because already several plans for moving ahead are underway.

Faculty cannot help but be affected by these results. Certainly we will continue to put forth a maximum effort to provide a strong program of instruction. Participation in a field-based program, even a modified one such as Block, requires a tremendous amount of time and energy. Now we know that there is a successful pay-off to those efforts. Beyond this, however, we are very much interested in pursuing other kinds of questions. If anything, this study is significant because of what we haven't found out. For example, we don't know:

A. Why our graduates are being hired.

B. Why our graduates are being rejected (when this occurs).

C. How successful our graduates are in the performance of their teaching duties, as student teachers or as teachers in full-time beginning service.

D. The placement record of elementary majors who opt for other programs. (Information not presently available)

E. If we could be successful in helping Block students find jobs after graduation or later.

At this particular point we are committed to the exploration of these questions. Which we will investigate is dependent upon the time and additional support available to us.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
School of Education
EDUCATION BUILDING
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

AREA CODE 812
TEL. NO.

Dear

Greetings again! Presently, we are engaged in a study to ascertain the whereabouts and present activities of the graduates of the Block Program in the years 1973, 1974, and 1975. Since you are one of the graduates of our program, may we ask you to participate in this survey?

Please check the answers pertinent to you and fill in the information asked for in the blank spaces provided.

Many, many thanks for your cooperation.

Cordially,

Ash

Ashley Bishop

Ed

Edward Buffie

— — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

After you graduated from school in the year _____, were you looking for a teaching position? ☐ yes ☐ no

If no, why were you not looking for a teaching position?

☐ Got married

☐ Went on to graduate school

☐ Realized teaching not for me

☐ Expecting a child

☐ Interested in other jobs

Others _____

_____

- - - -

If yes, were you able to get a teaching position? ☐ yes ☐ no

If so, where did you teach?

_____ _____
Principal

_____
Name of School Address

_____
City State

Role: (grade level taught, team teaching, self-contained classroom, departmentalization) _____

Are you still teaching at the above school? If not, what are you presently doing? (If teaching, provide some information as above (Principal/School/etc.)

How many different places did you apply? (Please estimate) _____

How did you get your teaching position?

☐ Through contact with I.U. Placement Bureau

☐ Through contact with a friend

☐ Through contact with an association

☐ Through personal application

Others _____

_____

If you were looking for a position but are not teaching, did you receive any offers? ☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, why did you turn the job down?

If you were unable to get a teaching position, what did you then do?

_____

_____

If you have another kind of job, describe the job you now hold.

_____

_____

Did your preparation as an Elementary Major help you get this job?

☐ yes ☐ no

If you did not find a teaching position and would like our assistance, please list any special considerations that you would like us to keep in mind regarding job location, grade level, type of community or school, etc. _____

_____

Please give your present address.

_____

_____

City State Zip Code

☐ Check this box if you would like a summary of our study.

APPENDIX II

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
School of Education
EDUCATION BUILDING
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

TEL. NO. 812—

December, 1975

Dear Mr. and Mrs. _____:

We have been trying to get in touch with your son or daughter regarding the enclosed questionnaire. As you might suspect, it's very difficult sometimes to locate people after they have left campus following graduation.

Your cooperation would be very much appreciated. We hope that you would do one of two things; (1) fill out the enclosed to the best of your ability and return to us immediately; or (2) send the enclosed to your son or daughter for response. The former option is perfectly satisfactory and, in the interest of time, we encourage you to do this.

Many, many thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Ashley Bishop, Director
of the Block Program

Edward G. Buffie,
Professor of Education

EGB:ms

Enclosure

STUDENT LOCATIONS

Alabama
Alaska, Angoon, Anchorage
Arizona
California
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kentucky
Michigan
Mississippi
Missouri
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Texas
Virginia
Washington
Washington, D.C.

Nicaragua